REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-39.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated over Monteiro et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,434,622 (hereinafter Monteiro). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 12 recite, in part:

a plurality of information receiver and transmitter devices (IRRTs) coupled to the Internet wherein each IRRT is for receiving and rendering broadcast information and for selectively retransmitting the broadcast information to another IRRT.

Claims 1 and 12 recite that the IRRTs are for receiving and *rendering* broadcast information and are also for selectively retransmitting the broadcast information to another IRRT. Thus, in one embodiment a chain of IRRTs are possible, with each one receiving broadcast information from a previous IRRT in the chain, rendering at least a portion of it and passing it on to another IRRT in the chain.

Monteiro fails to disclose a "plurality of IRRTs for receiving and rendering broadcast information and for selectively retransmitting the broadcast information to another IRRT." In Figure 1, Monteiro discloses a number of media servers 30 with a single media server coupled to one or more users 40. The media servers 40 may transmit a signal to the users. However, Monteiro does not disclose that the media

servers render the signal. While the users 40 may render the signal, Monteiro fails to disclose the users 40 retransmitting the signal. For example, in Figures 1, 2, 3, and 5 the user 40 is always at the end of the line and is never shown retransmitting the signal. Thus, Monteiro fails to disclose <u>nodes receiving and rendering broadcast information and selectively retransmitting the broadcast information to another node</u>, as claimed.

The Applicant does not understand Monteiro to disclose anywhere that the non-user nodes, such as the media or router nodes <u>render</u> the signal or a portion thereof. At col. 6, lines 7-19 Monteiro discloses that the media nodes may hardware broadcast, multicast and/or unicast to user nodes, but Applicant does not understand Monteiro to disclose that the media nodes <u>render</u> the signal or a portion thereof. At col. 6, lines 53-56 Monteiro discloses that the routers can be used as the media nodes, wherein the routers <u>store and forward</u> IP packets. However, Applicant does not understand this passage to disclose "receiving and <u>rendering</u> a broadcast signal and selectively retransmitting the signal," as claimed.

For the foregoing rationale, it is respectfully asserted that Claims 1 and 12 are not anticipated by Monteiro. As such, allowance of Claims 1 and 12 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 16 recites, in part:

a) causing a primary server to communicate a first stream of data packets representing primary broadcast information to a <u>first user device and rendering said primary broadcast information thereon</u>...

c) causing said <u>first user device to communicate</u> a third stream of data packets representing said primary broadcast information <u>to a third user device and rendering said primary broadcast information thereon</u>, wherein said third user device is coupled to the Internet and configured for rendering said primary broadcast information.

Claim 16 recites that primary broadcast information is transmitted to a <u>first user device and rendered thereon</u>. The primary broadcast information is transmitted from the first user device to a <u>third user device and rendered thereon</u>.

For the reasons discussed in the response to Claims 1 and 12, Monteiro fails to disclose "primary broadcast information transmitted to a first user device and <u>rendered thereon</u> and <u>transmitted from the first user device to a third user device</u> and <u>rendered thereon</u>," as claimed. Therefore, Claim 16 is not anticipated by Monteiro. Allowance of Claim 16 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 26 recites, in part:

a) causing a Web server to communicate a first stream of data packets representing content of an URL (Uniform Resource Locator) to a first user device and causing said first user device to render said content thereon when said URL is accesses by said first user device; and

b) causing said first user device to communicate a second stream of data packets representing said content of said URL to a second user'device and causing said second user device to render said content thereon when said second user device accesses said URL pseudo-simultaneously with said first user device.

Claim 26 recites that URL content is communicated to a first user device and rendered thereon, and the URL content is communicated from the first user device to a second user device and rendered thereon.

For the reasons discussed in the response to Claims 1 and 12, Monteiro fails to disclose "URL content transmitted to a first user device and <u>rendered thereon</u> and transmitted from the first user device to a second user device and <u>rendered thereon</u>," as claimed. Therefore, Claim 26 is not anticipated by Monteiro. Allowance of Claim 26 is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, allowance of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-39 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-39 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant remarks, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: _12/28_, 2002

Ronald M Pomerenke
Ronald M. Pomerenke
Registration No. 43,009

Address:

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

Telephone:

(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile